

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/511,425	Applicant(s) GIANOLIO ET AL.	
	Examiner Marianne L. Padgett	Art Unit 1762	

All Participants:(1) Marianne L. Padgett.(2) Kent Cheng.**Status of Application:** New(3) Alan Morrison (10/1/07).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 September 2007**Time:** 12:45**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential objections

Claims discussed:

1, 11, 13, 15, 21-23, 27, 37, 39, 41, 45, 48 & 50

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



MARIANNE PADGETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Left a telephone message proposing an examiner's amendment on Saturday, just past noon, suggesting inserting -- a -- before "silane" & "siloxane" in the independent claims 1, 27 & 50, to clarify reference to the generic classes, as opposed to specific compound, which as the claims & paragraph bridging pages 2-3 in the original specification are referring to attached functional groups, the generic would be the logical meaning. The other above listed dependent claims all have further limitations directed to one alternative option that has not been positively selected, thus proposed adding positive language to these claims. On 10/1/2007, discussed the proposals with Mr. Morrison, as Mr. Cheng was out of the country & he approved proposed amendments to the independent claims, but desired consultation with the applicants on the dependant claims, however as the dependant limitations discussed do not materially effect the allowability, the Examiner's amendment will only address the independent claims, with applicants directing further consideration to the listed dependant claims, to be amended or not by 312 amendment.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'MJP' or similar, located at the bottom left of the page.